

**FIVE COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
HOW-TO-APPLY CDBG APPLICATION WORKSHOP
ATTENDANCE POLICY**

Attendance at one workshop within the region is mandatory by all prospective applicants or an “OFFICIAL” representative of said applicant. [State Policy]

Attendance at the workshop by a county commissioner, mayor, city council member, or county clerk satisfies the above referenced attendance requirement of the prospective applicant’s jurisdiction. In addition, attendance by a city manager, town clerk, or county administrator also satisfies this requirement.

Jurisdictions may formally designate a third party representative (i.e., other city/county staff, consultant, engineer, or architect) to attend the workshop on their behalf. Said designation by the jurisdiction shall be in writing. The letter of designation shall be provided to the Five County Association no later than at the beginning of the workshop.

Attendance by prospective eligible “sub-grantees”, which may include non-profit agencies, special service districts, housing authorities, etc. is strongly recommended so that they may become familiar with the application procedures. If a city/town or county elects to sponsor a sub-grantee it is the responsibility of that jurisdiction to ensure the timely and accurate preparation of the CDBG application on behalf of the sub-grantee.

Extraordinary circumstances relating to this policy shall be presented to the Executive Director of the Five County Association of Governments for consideration by the Regional Review Committee (Steering Committee).

**FIVE COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT
GENERAL POLICIES**

1. Five County AOG staff will visit each applicant on site for an evaluation/review meeting.
2. All applications will be evaluated by the Five County Association of Governments Community and Economic Development staff using criteria approved by the Steering Committee.
3. Staff will present prioritization recommendation to the RRC (Steering Committee) for consideration and approval.
4. Maximum amount per year \$150,000.00.

Adopted by the Five County Association of Governments Regional Review Committee (Steering Committee) August 14, 2002; Revised by Steering Committee on August 11, 2004 and August 17, 2005.

5. Maximum years for multi-year funding are 2 years at \$150,000 per year.
6. All applications for multi-year funding must contain a complete budget and breakdown for each specific year of funding.
7. Applications on behalf of sub-recipients (i.e., special service districts, non-profit organizations, etc.) are encouraged. However, the applicant city or county must understand that even if they name the sub-recipient as project manager the city/county is still responsible for the project's viability and program compliance. The applying entity must be willing to maintain an active oversight of both the project and the sub-recipient's contract performance. An inter-local agreement between the applicant entity and the sub-recipient must accompany the pre-application. The inter-local agreement must detail who will be the project manager and how the sponsoring entity and sub-recipient will coordinate work on the project. A letter from the governing board of the sub-recipient requesting the sponsorship of the project must accompany the pre-application. This letter must be signed by the board chairperson.
8. Projects must be consistent with the District's Consolidated Plan. The project applied for must be included in the prioritized capital improvements list that the entity submitted for inclusion in the Consolidated Plan. Projects sponsored on behalf of an eligible sub-recipient may not necessarily be listed in the jurisdictions capital investment plan, but the sub-recipient's project must meet goals identified in the region's Consolidated Plan.
9. Previously allocated set-aside funding:
 - \$150,000 Five County AOG (Planning and Technical Assistance Grant)
 - \$150,000 Beaver Co. (Milford Senior Citizen Center Replacement Phase II)
10. Emergency projects may be considered by the Regional Review Committee (FCAOG Steering Committee) at any time. Projects applying for emergency funding must still meet a national objective and regional goals and policies.
Projects may be considered as an emergency application if:
 - Funding through the normal application timeframe will create an unreasonable risk to health or property.
 - An appropriate 3rd party agency has documented a specific risk(s) that in their opinion needs immediate remediation.
 - Cost overruns from a previously funded project may be funded only if the RCC (Steering Committee) deems it an appropriate emergency.

If an applicant wishes to consider applying for emergency funds, they should contact the Five County Association of Governments CDBG Program Specialist as soon as possible to discuss the state required application procedure as well as regional criteria. Emergency funds (distributed statewide) are limited on an annual basis to \$500,000. The amount of any emergency funds distributed during the year will be subtracted from the top of the appropriate region

Five County Association of Governments CDBG Rating and Ranking Program Year 2006

Data Sources

1. **CAPACITY TO CARRY OUT THE GRANT:** Consultation with state CDBG staff based upon grants during the previous five years. Previous grantees will be advised if they received a poor or fair evaluation and will have an opportunity to present a plan to the State and AOG staff as to how problems with the previous grant will be avoided in the administration of this year's grant. A score of 2.5 will be received following approval of said plan. New grantees are presumed to have the capacity to adequately administer their grant and by default will receive 2.5 points. Previous grantees who were funded more than 5 years ago are considered to be new grantees for the purposes of this evaluation. If any grantee proposes to utilize an experienced outside consultant, for grant administration, a good or excellent rating may be awarded. In order to be eligible to receive new funding, a grantee/sub-grantee must have drawn down at least 50 percent of their previous year's CDBG grant funds at the time of regional rating and ranking.
2. **GRANT ADMINISTRATION:** Grant administration costs will be taken from the CDBG pre-application. Those making a concerted effort to minimize grant administration costs taken from CDBG funds will be awarded extra points.
3. **JOB CREATION:** Information provided by applicant prior to rating and ranking. Applicant must be able to adequately support proposed figures for job creation or retention potential. This pertains to permanent jobs created as a result of the project, not jobs utilized in the construction of a project. Two part-time employees = 1 full-time.
4. **UNEMPLOYMENT:** "Utah Economic and Demographic Profiles" (most current issue available prior to rating and ranking), provided by Utah Office of Planning and Budget; or "Utah Labor Market Report" (most current issue with annual averages), provided by Department of Workforce Services.
5. **FINANCIAL COMMITMENT TO COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT (Self-Help Financing):** From figures provided by applicant in grant application. Documentation of the source(s) and status (whether already secured or not) of any and all proposed "matching" funds must be provided prior to the rating and ranking of the application by the RRC. Any changes made in the dollar amount of proposed funding, after rating and ranking has taken place, shall require reevaluation of the rating received on this criteria. A determination will then be made as to whether the project's overall ranking and funding prioritization is affected by the score change.

Use of an applicant's local funds and/or leveraging of other matching funds is strongly encouraged in CDBG funded projects in the Five County Region. This allows for a greater number of projects to be accomplished in a given year. Acceptable matches include property, materials available and specifically committed to this project, and cash. Due to federal restrictions unacceptable matches include donated labor, use of equipment, etc. All match proposed must be quantified as cash equivalent through an

acceptable process before the match can be used. Documentation on how and by whom the match is quantified is required. "Secured" means that a letter or applications of intent exist to show that other funding sources have been requested as match to the proposed project. If leveraged funds are not received then the points given for that match will be deducted and the project's rating reevaluated.

A jurisdiction's population (most current estimate provided by Utah Office of Planning and Budget) will determine whether they are Category A, B, C or D for the purpose of this criteria.

6. **CDBG DOLLARS REQUESTED PER CAPITA:** Determined by dividing the dollar amount requested in the CDBG application by the population of the jurisdiction, using most current population estimate provided by Utah Office of Planning and Budget.
7. **LOCAL JURISDICTIONS COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVES: THRESHOLD CRITERIA:** Every applicant is required to document that the project for which they are applying is consistent with that community's and the Five County District Consolidated Plan. The project, or project type, must be a high priority in the investment component (Capital Investment Plan (CIP) One-Year Action Plan). The applicant must include evidence that the community was and continues to be a willing partner in the development of the regional (five-county) consolidated planning process. (See CDBG Application Guide.)
8. **COUNTY'S COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT GOALS AND POLICIES:** Prioritization will be determined by the three (3) appointed Steering Committee members representing the county in which the proposed project is located. The three (3) members of the Steering Committee include: one County Commission Representative, one Mayor's Representative, and one School Board Representative. (Note: for AOG application, determination is made by the Steering Committee Chair, in consultation with the AOG Executive Committee.)
9. **REGIONAL COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT GOALS AND POLICIES:** Determined by the Executive Director with consultation of the AOG Executive Committee. The Executive Committee is comprised of one County Commissioner from each of the five counties.
10. **IMPROVEMENTS TO, OR EXPANSION OF, LMI HOUSING STOCK, OR PROVIDING AFFORDABLE HOUSING ACCESSIBILITY TO LMI RESIDENTS:** Information provided by the applicant. Applicant must be able to adequately explain reasoning which supports proposed figures, for the number of LMI housing units to be constructed or substantially rehabilitated with the assistance of this grant. Or the number of units this grant will make accessible to LMI residents through loan closing or down payment assistance.
11. **AFFORDABLE HOUSING PLAN IMPLEMENTATION:** In January, 1999, the Community and Economic Development State Legislative Committee passed a resolution requiring the Community Impact Fund and the Community Development Block Grant Program to implement rating and ranking criteria that would award jurisdictions that had complied with HB 295 law and had adopted their Affordable Housing Plans when they applied for

funding from these two programs. The CDBG State Policy Board adopted the following rating and ranking criteria to be used by each regional rating and ranking system: *"To further the objectives of HB 295, applications received from communities/counties, which have plans completed and adopted, to further the development of affordable housing, will be given additional points."* Projects which actually demonstrate implementation of a jurisdiction's Affordable Housing Plan policies will be given points. Applicants must provide sufficient documentation to justify their project does, in fact, comply with this criteria. Towns applying for credit under this criteria may either meet a goal in their adopted Affordable Housing Plan or the project meets a regional affordable housing goal in the Consolidated Plan.

12. **GEOGRAPHIC EXTENT OF PROJECT'S IMPACT:** The actual area to be benefited by the project applied for.
13. **PER CAPITA INCOME OF APPLICANT'S COUNTY RELATIVE TO STATE PER CAPITA INCOME:** Utah Department of Workforce Services; or more current source available prior to rating and ranking.
14. **PROPERTY TAX RATE FOR JURISDICTION:** Base tax rate for community or county, as applicable, will be taken from the "Statistical Review of Government in Utah", or most current source using the most current edition available prior to rating and ranking. Basis for determining percent are the maximum tax rates allowed in the Utah Code: .70% for municipalities, and .32% for counties.
15. **PERCENTAGE OF APPLICANT'S JURISDICTION WHO ARE LOW TO MODERATE INCOME:** Figures from the most current available census data provided by the State Department of Community and Economic Development. If a community or county is not on the DCED provided "HUD Pre-approved List", the figures will be provided from the results of a DCED approved income survey conducted by the applicant of the project benefit area households.
16. **EXTENT OF POVERTY:** Based on information provided by applicant prior to rating and ranking that satisfactorily documents the percentage of Very Low Income and Extremely Low Income VLI/EMI persons directly benefiting from a project.
17. **PRESUMED LMI GROUP:** Applicant will provide information as to what percent of the proposed project will assist a presumed LMI group as defined in the current program year CDBG Application Guide handbook.
18. **SUCCESSFUL PARTICIPATION IN QUALITY GROWTH COMMUNITY PROGRAMS:** The State of Utah emphasizes the importance of incorporating quality growth principles in the planning and operation of city government. Communities that demonstrate their desire to improve through planning will receive additional points in the rating and ranking process.

In the rating and ranking of CDBG applications, the region will recognize an applicant's accomplishments consistent with these principles by adding additional points when evaluating the following:

- **Demonstration of local responsibility for planning and land-use in their communities in coordination and cooperation with other governments**
- **Development of efficient infrastructure including water and energy conservation**

- **Incorporation of housing opportunity and affordability into community planning**
- **Protection and conservation plan for water, air, critical lands, important agricultural lands and historic resources**

Worksheet #18 will be used in the rating and ranking process for applicants who have taken the opportunity to provide additional information and documentation in order to receive these additional points.

- 19. Application Quality:** Quality of the Pre-Application in terms of project identification, justification, and well-defined scope of work likely to address identified problems.
- 20. Project Maturity:** Funding should be prioritized to those projects which are the most "mature". For the purposes of this process, maturity is defined as those situations where:
1) the applicant has assigned a project manager; 2) has selected an engineer and/or architect through a formal process in accordance with applicable laws and regulations; 3) knows who will administer the grant; 4) proposed solution to problem is identified in the Scope of Work and ready to proceed immediately; and 5) identifies all funding sources and funding maturity status. Projects that are determined to not be sufficiently mature, so as to be ready to proceed in a timely manner, may not be rated and ranked.

**FIVE COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
FY 2006 CDBG RATING AND RANKING CRITERIA and APPLICANT'S PROJECT SCORE SHEET**

The Five County Association of Governments Steering Committee has established this criteria for the purpose of rating and ranking fairly and equitably all Community Development Block Grant Pre-Applications received for funding during FY 2006. Only projects which are determined to be threshold eligible will be rated and ranked. Eligibility will be determined following review of the submitted CDBG Pre-Application with all supporting documentation provided prior to rating and ranking. **Please review the attached Data Sources Sheet for a more detailed explanation of each criteria.**

Applicant:		Requested CDBG \$'s		Ranking:		of		Total Score:	
-------------------	--	----------------------------	--	-----------------	--	-----------	--	---------------------	--

CDBG Rating and Ranking Criteria Description Five County Association of Governments		Data	Data Range/Score (circle only one for each criteria)							Score	X Weight	Total Score
1	Capacity to Carry Out The Grant: Performance history of capacity to administer grant. First-time & <5-yr grantees: default 2.5 points		Excellent 4 points	Very Good 3 points	Good 2 points	Fair 1 point	Poor 0 points				1.0	
2	Grant Administration: Concerted effort made by grantee to minimize grant administration costs.		100% Other Funds 3 points	1 - 5% 2 points	5.1 - 10% 1 point						1.0	
3	Job Creation: Estimated number of new jobs completed project will create or number of jobs retained that would be lost without this project.		> 4 Jobs 4 points	3-4 Jobs 3 points	2 Jobs 2 points	1 Job 1 point					1.5	
4	Unemployment: What percentage is applicant County's unemployment percentage rate above State average percentage rate?	%	6% or greater 3.5 points	5% above state average 3 points	4% above state average 2.5 points	3% above state average 2 points	2% above state average 1.5 points	1% above state avg. 1 point	Equal to or < state average 0 points		.5	
5 A	Financial Commitment to Community Development (Self-help Financing) - (<i>Jurisdiction Population <1,000</i>) Percent of non-CDBG funds invested in total project cost	%	> 10% 5 points	7.1 % - 10% 4 points	4.1% - 7% 3 points	1% - 4% 2 points	< 1% 1 point				2.0	

Adopted by the Five County Association of Governments Regional Review Committee (Steering Committee) August 14, 2002; Revised by Steering Committee on August 11, 2004 and August 17, 2005.

CDBG Rating and Ranking Criteria Description Five County Association of Governments		Data	Data Range/Score (circle only one for each criteria)						Score	X Weight	Total Score
5 B	Financial Commitment to Community Development (Self-help Financing) - (<u>Jurisdiction Population 1,000 - 2,500</u>) Percentage of non-CDBG funds invested in total project	%	> 20% 5 points	15.1 - 20% 4 points	10.1 - 15% 3 points	5.1 - 10% 2 points	1 - 5.0% 1 point			2.0	
5 C	Financial Commitment to Community Development (Self-help Financing) - (<u>Jurisdiction Population 2,501 - 6,000</u>) Percentage of Non-CDBG funds invested in total project	%	> 40% 5 points	30.1 - 40% 4 points	20.1 - 30% 3 points	10.1 - 20% 2 points	1 - 10% 1 point			2.0	
5 D	Financial Commitment to Community Development (Self-help Financing) - (<u>Jurisdiction Population >6,000</u>) Percentage of non-CDBG funds invested in total project	%	> 50% 5 points	40.1 - 50% 4 points	30.1 - 40% 3 points	20.1 - 30% 2 points	1 - 20% 1 point			2.0	

Adopted by the Five County Association of Governments Regional Review Committee (Steering Committee) August 14, 2002; Revised by Steering Committee on August 11, 2004 and August 17, 2005.

6	CDBG funds Requested Per Capita: CDBG funds requested divided by population		\$1 - 100 5 points	\$101-200 4 points	\$201- 400 3 points	\$401 - 800 2 points	\$801 or > 1 point			1.0	
7 T*	Jurisdiction's Project Priority: Project priority rating in Regional Consolidated Plan, (<u>Capital Investment Plan - One-Year Action Plan</u>)		High # 1 5 points	High # 2 4 points	High # 3 3 points	High # 4 2 points	High # 5 1 point	High # >5 0 points		2.5	
8	County's Project Priority: Prioritization will be determined by the three (3) appointed Steering Committee members representing the county in which the proposed project is located. The three (3) members of the Steering Committee include: one County Commission Representative, one Mayor's Representative, and one School Board Representative. (Note: for AOG application, determination is made by the Steering Committee Chair, in consultation with the AOG Executive Committee.)		# 1 5 points	# 2 4 points	# 3 3 points	# 4 2 points	# 5 1 point	#6 or > 0 points		2.5	
9	Regional Project Priority: Determined by the Executive Director with consultation of the AOG Executive Committee. The Executive Committee is comprised of one (1) County Commissioner from each of the five counties.		# 1 5 points	# 2 4 points	# 3 3 points	# 4 2 points	# 5 1 point	#6 or > 0 points		2.5	
10	LMI Housing Stock: Number of units constructed, rehabilitated, or made accessible to LMI residents		> 15 Units 4 points	8 - 15 Units 3 points	3 - 8 Units 2 points	2 Units 1 point				1.0	
11	Affordable Housing Plan Implementation: City has adopted an Affordable Housing Plan and this project specifically demonstrates implementation of policies in the Plan (Criteria required by the State Legislature). Towns applying for credit under this criteria may <u>either</u> meet a goal in their adopted Affordable Housing Plan or the project meets a regional affordable housing goal in the Consolidated Plan.		YES 2 points	No 0 points						1.0	
12	Project's Geographical Impact: Area benefiting from project.		Regional 6 points	Multi-county 5 points	County-wide 4 points	Multi-community 3 points	Community 2 points	Portion of Community 1 point		1.5	
13	Applicant's County Per Capita Income (PCI): as compared to State's PCI to target distressed areas from 2000 Census.	%	70% or < 5 points	71 - 80% 4 points	81 - 90% 3 points	90 - 100% 2 points	100-110% 1 point	> 110% 0 points		1.0	

Adopted by the Five County Association of Governments Regional Review Committee (Steering Committee) August 14, 2002; Revised by Steering Committee on August 11, 2004 and August 17, 2005.

14	Jurisdiction's Property Tax Rate: In response to higher demand for services, many communities have already raised tax rates to fund citizen needs. The communities that maintain an already high tax burden (as compared to the tax ceiling set by state law) will be given higher points for this category. Property tax rate as a percent of the maximum allowed by law (3 point default for non-taxing jurisdiction)	%	61% or > 5 points	51 - 60% 4 points	41 - 50% 3 points	31 - 40% 2 points	21 - 30% 1 point	< 20% 0 points		1.0	
15	Jurisdiction's LMI Population: Percent of residents considered LMI (based on 2000 Census Data or Survey)	%	91 - 100% 5 points	81 - 90% 4 points	71 - 80% 3 points	61 - 70% 2 points	51 - 60% 1 point			1.0	
16	Extent of Poverty: If an applicant satisfactorily documents the percentage of very low income (VLI) and extremely low income (ELI) persons directly benefiting from a project; or can show the percentage of VLI/ELI of the community as a whole; additional points shall be given in accordance with the following. Percentage of total population of jurisdiction or project area who are very low income and extremely low income.	%	20% or More 5 points	15 - 19% 4 points	10 - 14% 3 points	5 - 9% 2 points	1 - 4% 1 point			1.0	
17	Presumed LMI Group: Project specifically serves CDBG identified LMI groups, i.e. elderly, disabled, homeless, etc., as stipulated in CDBG Application Guide	%	100% 5 points	80 - 99% 4 points	60 - 79% 3 points	51 - 59% 2 points				1.0	
18	Successful Participation in Quality Growth Community Program: Reflects on communities pro-active for growth and needs through planning and land use in their communities; coordination and cooperation with other governments; development of efficient infrastructure; incorporation of housing opportunity and affordability in community planning; and protection and conservation plan for water, air, critical lands, important agricultural lands and historic resources. Score comes from Worksheet #18.		Very High 4 points	High 3 points	Fair 2 points	Low 1 point				1.0	
19	Application Quality: Application identifies problem, contains a well-defined scope of work and is cost-effective. Score comes from Worksheet #19.		Excellent 6 points	Very Good 5 points	Good 4 points	Fair 3 points	Acceptable 2 points	Poor 1 point		2.0	

Adopted by the Five County Association of Governments Regional Review Committee (Steering Committee) August 14, 2002; Revised by Steering Committee on August 11, 2004 and August 17, 2005.

20	Project Maturity: Project demonstrates capacity to be implemented and/or completed in the 18 month contract period and is clearly documented. Score comes from Worksheet #20.		Excellent 6 points	Very Good 5 points	Good 4 points	Fair 3 points	Acceptable 2 points	Poor 1 point		2.0	
----	--	--	---------------------------	---------------------------	----------------------	----------------------	----------------------------	---------------------	--	-----	--

PLEASE NOTE: Criteria marked with a T* is a THRESHOLD eligibility requirement for the CDBG Program. < = Less Than > = More Than

Previously Allocated Set-Aside Funding:
\$150,000 – Five County AOG (Planning and Technical Assistance Grant)
\$150,000 – Beaver County (Milford Senior Citizen Center Replacement - Phase II)

CRITERIA 18 WORKSHEET

SUCCESSFUL PARTICIPATION IN QUALITY GROWTH COMMUNITY PROGRAM		
Criteria	Support Documentation Provided	Score (4 Points Total)
1. Has the local jurisdiction provided information demonstrating pro-active planning and land use in their community in coordination and cooperation with other governments?	Yes____ 1 point No____ 0 points 1 point	
2. Has the applicant documented that the project is in accordance with an <u>adopted</u> master plan (i.e., water facilities master plan, etc.)	Yes____ 1 point No____ 0 points 1 point	
3. Has the applicant documented a <u>non-exclusionary policy</u> for housing affordability and opportunity in community planning (i.e. General Plan housing policies, development fee deferral policies, etc.)	Yes____ 1 point No____ 0 points 1 point	

4. Has the applicant documented adopted plans or general plan elements addressing conservation of water, air, critical lands, important agricultural lands and historic resources?	Yes____ 1 point No____ 0 points 1 point	
		Total Points

Very High = 4 points
 High = 3 points
 Fair = 2 points
 Low = 1 point

CRITERIA 19 WORKSHEET

APPLICATION QUALITY			
Criteria	Support Documentation	Other Documentation	Score (10 Points Total)
1. Problem Identification	Additional written text provided? Yes____ 1 point No____ 0 points 1 point	Detailed Architectural/Engineering Report prepared? Yes____ 2 points No____ 0 points 2 points	
2. Is proposed solution well defined in Scope of Work? In other words, is solution likely to solve problem?	Yes____ 1 point No____ 0 points 1 point		

3. Does the application give a concise description of how the project will be completed in a timely manner?	Yes____ 1 point No____ 0 points 1 point		
4. Proposed project does <u>not</u> duplicate any existing services or activities already available and provided to beneficiaries in that jurisdiction through other programs, i.e. those locally or regionally based.	Yes____ 5 points (Does not Duplicate) 5 points No____ 0 points (Duplicates Services) 0 points		
			Total Points

Excellent	=	10 points	Fair	=	7 points
Very Good	=	9 points	Acceptable	=	6 points
Good	=	8 points	Poor	=	5 points

CRITERIA 20 WORKSHEET

PROJECT MATURITY		
Criteria	Status	Score (6 Points Total)
1. Architect/Engineer already selected at time of application through formal RFP process	Yes____ 1 point No____ 0 points 1 point	
2. Has application identified dedicated and involved project manager?	Yes____ 1 point No____ 0 points	
3. Is the proposed solution to problem identified in the Scope of Work <u>ready to proceed immediately</u> ?	(Well Defined) Yes____ 1 point No____ 0 points 1 point	
4. Has applicant identified all funding sources?	Yes____ 1 point No____ 0 points 1 point	
5. Funding Status (Maturity)	All other project funding is applied for but not committed. Yes____ 1 point No____ 0 points 1 point (or) All other project funding is in place for immediate use. Yes____ 1 point No____ 0 points 2 points (or) Is CDBG the only funding source for the project? Yes____ 1 point No____ 0 points 2 points	
		Total Points

Excellent	=	6 points	Fair	=	3 points
Very Good	=	5 points	Acceptable	=	2 points
Good	=	4 points	Poor	=	1 point

Adopted by the Five County Association of Governments Regional Review Committee (Steering Committee) August 14, 2002; Revised by Steering Committee on August 11, 2004 and August 17, 2005.